

CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-25 are rejected.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-18, 21-22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Publication No. 2002/0004813 to Agrawal et al. (hereinafter “Agrawal”).

Claims 5, 12, 19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal in view of “Using HTML 4” by Patterson et al. (hereinafter “Patterson”).

Claims 6, 13, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated Agrawal.

Independent claim 1 of Applicants’ application recites a method comprising: receiving a message at a computing device, wherein the message comprises a set of message headers and a message body, wherein the message body contains a top-level fragment; and retrieving a message header from the message, wherein the message header indicates that the message body includes a linking element to a next-level fragment. Independent claims 8, 15, and 22 also recite a “message header” that “indicates that the message body includes a linking element to a next-level fragment.”

Examiner asserts, on page 3 of the current Office Action, that the “<Tag Extension ‘caching properties’> and enclosed materials” shown in Figure 4 of Agrawal are viewed, for purposes of examination, as a “linking element to a next level fragment.” The description of the <Tag Extension “caching properties”> in the Agrawal specification, however, does not support Examiner’s interpretation. For example paragraph 37 of Agrawal states:

According to the present invention, special JSP tag extensions may be defined that allow application developers to specify the caching properties of the constituent blocks in a page, such as an XML document or a Web page. According to the present invention, the application developer need only enclose each block identified as potentially cacheable with such special tags, and specify the caching properties (caching properties define when and the conditions under which the cached blocks are invalidated--if ever) as attributes to these special tags. (emphasis added)

The discussion above makes it clear that the <Tag Extension “caching properties”> disclosed in Agrawal are used to define the conditions under which a potentially cacheable block is invalidated. There is no discussion in Agrawal that provides support for the proposition that the <Tag Extension “caching properties”> provide a linking element to a next level fragment, as recited in Applicants’ independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22.

Dependent claims 3, 10, and 17 each recite that the linking element is used to obtain a source identifier for the next level fragment. Dependent claims 5, 12, 19 and 23 each recite that the linking element comprises a source identifier, wherein the source identifier is formatted as a uniform resource identifier (URI). Dependent claims 6, 13, 20 and 24 each recite that the linking element is defined using standard generalized markup language (SGML). None of the above-referenced limitations in these dependent claims is disclosed in the Agrawal reference.

For the reasons discussed above, the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated Agrawal, should be removed and these claims should be allowed. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21, and 23-25 are allowable, if for no other reason that they depend upon allowable independent claims. However, they have additional limitations which are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
February 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary W. Hamilton/

Gary W. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 31,834